



**SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

Friday 20 January 2023 10:00-11:30 a.m. via Zoom

**Attendance:** Guy Faulkner (Chair), James Stewart (Vice-Chair), Melina Amirsharafi, Robert Boushel, Nancy Ford, Romina Hajizadeh, Greg Martyn, James Olson, Susan Porter

**Regrets:** Benjamin Fischer, Jorden Hendry, Rob Kozak, Merje Kuus, Gail Murphy, Anubhav Singh

**Senate Staff:** Michael Jud

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting of the Senate Research and Scholarship Committee (the “Committee”) was called to order at 10:03 a.m. on 20 January 2023 by G. Faulkner, Chair.

**ITEM 1: ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

The agenda was approved by general consent.

**ITEM 2: MEETING MINUTES OF 16 DECEMBER 2022**

The meeting minutes of 16 December 2022 were approved by general consent.

It was noted that Gail Murphy in her capacity as Vice-President, Research & Innovation had delivered a very well-received presentation of the VPRI Annual Report to the Vancouver Senate on January 18. The Chair requested that the Committee’s thanks be conveyed to Dr. Murphy.

The Committee received an update on the status of Agenda Item 3 from the Committee’s December 16, 2022 meeting: Terms of Reference of an Academic Advisory Committee on a UBC Institute for Advanced Study. It was noted that the sections of the terms of reference dealing with the Academic Advisory Committee’s Senate representatives have been revised in line with feedback received from the Research and Scholarship Committee and Senate staff. The Senate Office plans to submit the revised terms of reference for this Academic Advisory Committee well as the related Academic Advisory Committee on the Wall Research Awards and Fellowships to the other relevant Senate committees (Vancouver Awards, Okanagan Learning & Research, Admissions and Awards) as an informational item by early February, with a concurrent effort to have the two Senate Nominating Committees agree on a process for the appointment of Senate representatives to the Academic Advisory Committee sometime in February.

**ITEM 3: DRAFT POLICY V-5 – RESEARCH CENTRES AND RESEARCH INSTITUTES**

Senate staff explained that draft Policy V-5 has been revised and expanded on the basis of the Committee's discussions at the meeting of December 16, 2022. In addition to major revisions, such as the addition of the Procedures section, minor editorial improvements have been made throughout.

Senate staff noted the ongoing difficulty around the issue of dual-campus centres and institutes (DCCIs) and offered a number of approaches to addressing this issue in the policy. The Committee subsequently agreed that DCCIs should be addressed via the policy's procedures, with a corresponding section added to the body of the policy empowering the Committee to determine procedures dealing with DCCIs.

It was noted that the sections of draft 1.0 dealing with periodic review of institutes and category 1 centres had been removed from the text due to unfavourable feedback received at the previous Committee meeting. Committee members noted that regular review of academic units is an important procedure, however the Committee itself is not the appropriate body to be conducting such reviews. It is more appropriate that they be organized and received at the faculty level. This form of review is also governed by the existing Senate policy on reviews of academic units.

Regarding the disestablishment of institutes and category 1 centres, it was noted that the relevant portions of the draft policy seem to leave this to the discretion of the Dean. Senate staff stated in response that an earlier draft of the policy was more prescriptive in this regard, however an effort was made to avoid explicitly assigning the Committee responsibility for policing inactive or non-compliant centres and institutes. It was noted that should the Committee become aware of units which are fit to be disestablished then there are a number of approaches towards achieving their disestablishment.

It was asked whether under the draft policy institutes and category 1 centres will be equivalent to departments and schools. Senate staff responded that they are not fully equivalent because certain policies (e.g., Board Policy AP9 – Academic Heads) define the term “academic unit” to include departments and schools but not centres and institutes. But for the purposes of most policies they may be seen as equivalent.

A concern was raised with respect to the role of the director of an institute or category 1 centre under the draft policy. If the Academic Heads Policy is inapplicable then it is unclear how some aspects of the director role will work. For example, will the appointment of directors involve collegial processes in the same manner as the appointment of academic heads? It was agreed that the policy consultation process will likely yield useful feedback on this issue.

With respect to the draft policy's procedures on the establishment of institutes and category 1 centres, it was suggested that proponents ought to be required to include information on anticipated timelines in their proposals. Senate staff undertook to revise the draft accordingly.

The Committee agreed that the draft policy is ready in principle to be circulated amongst a broader constituency for feedback. Senate staff indicated that the draft policy would be subject to one final round of edits to polish the text and implement the Committees feedback, and that a final draft would be circulated for review via email in the near future. One approved, the final draft will then be send out for consultation. The following parties were highlighted as likely recipients of the invitation to provide feedback:

- Deans and Department Heads
- Associate Deans' Table (Research)

- Associate Deans' Table (Faculty)
- Faculty Association
- University Counsel's Office
- VP Research and Innovation
- Graduate Students' Society
- Faculty Relations

#### **ITEM 4: UPDATE ON RESPONSE TO ACADEMIC FREEDOM POLICY CONSULTATION**

The Committee heard an update on Agenda Item 4 from its meeting of December 16, 2022: Response to Academic Freedom Policy Consultation. The research work that was commissioned at that meeting is now complete and has produced a very valuable piece of work. One aspect to consider is how to present this information. It may be worthwhile to make this research available as a public-facing document so that other institutions in Canada and internationally can reference it. In the meantime the aim is to present the research to the Committee at its next meeting for review.

Committee members expressed their thanks for this valuable work.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 11:09 a.m.